

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MIRAE ASSET SECURITIES CO., LTD,

Plaintiff,

v.

RYZE RENEWABLES HOLDINGS, LLC, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01492-APG-NJK

**Order**

[Docket Nos. 195, 196]

Pending before the Court is the parties' proposed discovery plan.<sup>1</sup> Docket No. 196. Defendants seek to stay discovery pending resolution of its forthcoming motion to dismiss or abstain. *Id.* at 6. However, this motion has not been filed, *see* Docket, and Defendants fail to address the governing standards for seeking a stay.<sup>2</sup> The parties have differing views about how this forthcoming motion affects the need and scope of discovery. *Id.* at 4.

Accordingly, the proposed discovery plan is **DENIED** without prejudice. Docket No. 196. If Defendants seek relief based on a forthcoming motion, they must file that motion expeditiously. Once they file that motion, they must file, by February 28, 2025, a request addressing the pertinent standards. *See Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 581 (D. Nev. 2013). If such a request to stay discovery is not filed, the parties must engage in a robust meet-and-confer to craft

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court expects a high degree of professionalism and civility from attorneys. *See* Local Rule 1-1(c). As the Court has already made abundantly clear, motions are not to be used to accuse opposing parties of gamesmanship or for mudslinging. *See* Docket No. 184 at 3. Despite the Court's previous order, the parties continue to attack each other. *See* Docket No. 196. These *ad hominem* attacks are distracting, unprofessional, and unnecessary. Attorneys must change their approach to this case and litigate it in an collegial and professional manner.

<sup>2</sup> It is unclear whether Defendants seek a stay of discovery, Docket No. 12 at 6, or a stay of proceedings, *id.* at 4.

1 a new stipulated discovery plan addressing how the motion affects discovery, which must be filed  
2 by February 28, 2025.

3 Pending also before the Court is the parties' proposed protective order. Docket No. 195.  
4 In light of the above circumstances, the Court **DENIES** without prejudice the parties' proposed  
5 protective order. *Id.*

6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: January 31, 2025

8   
9 Nancy J. Koppe  
10 United States Magistrate Judge  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28